## REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated June 8, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein.  Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application.

### I.        Preliminary Matter

Applicant notes that the Examiner did not initial all of the references listed on the PTO Form 1449 filed on July 12, 2005.  Therefore, Applicant requests that the Examiner initial all of the references listed and provide the Applicant with an initialed copy.

### II.       Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 7,173,730; hereinafter "Suzuki").

Suzuki is directed to the rule-based storage and reproduction of data. For example, input/output (I/O) devices such as printers, scanners, facsimile machines and digital cameras are interconnected in a computer network environment.  However, in the prior art, a user must specify a device at a time of the I/O operation and the data is then formatted for use.  The data cannot be dynamically reformatted for a different device.  Specifically, once data is formatted, in order to output data to another device, another request is necessary designating the other device. See col. 1, lines 1-45. Therefore, Suzuki attempts to overcome this deficiency in the prior art.

Claim 1 recites a "network data-transfer method of **transferring data** from a server on a network **to a network-connected equipment** wherein the network-connected equipment **which does not have a user interface performs a processing**." The Examiner asserts that server 15 of Suzuki teaches the claimed server. The Examiner appears to be citing the attachment unit 19 of

Suzuki for teaching the claimed client and the Examiner appears to be citing reproduction device

18 for teaching the claimed network-connected equipment. Specifically, the Examiner asserts on

page 2 of the Office Action that the server responds to requests transmitted by the attachment

unit.

However, assuming *arguendo* the Examiner is citing reproduction device 18 for teaching

the claimed network-connected equipment, the reproduction device 18 includes a printer, an

intelligent display, a scanner, a facsimile machine or a personal computer. See col.5, lines 60-

65. Further, col. 8, lines 35-46 of Suzuki states:

> "A user interface is provided for outputting
> information (e.g., information stored on portable memory
> device 21) and receiving instructions. **The user interface
> comprises a portion that is common to all reproduction
> devices 18 and another portion that is customized for use
> with a certain instance or type of reproduction device 18**
> coupled with attachment unit 19. For example, the
> customizable portion comprises options and/or information
> corresponding to the functionality provided by attachment
> unit 19. Thus, for example, the user interface displays for
> selection at least one entry corresponding to a data
> reference stored in portable memory device 21 and at least
> one selectable function associated of reproduction device
> 18."

Therefore, since the reproduction devices 18 of Suzuki have a user interface, Applicant

submits that the reproduction device 18 of Suzuki does not teach the claimed network-connected

equipment which does <u>not</u> have a user interface. Further, Suzuki is not at all concerned with the

transfer of data to network-connected equipment that do not have a user interface.

Claim 1 further recites "creating a **transfer-data to be transferred to the client** as a

response to the access to the server at the relaying, wherein the transfer-data includes a

processing data for the network-connected equipment." The Examiner asserts that col. 1, lines

19-22 of Suzuki teaches this aspect of the claim. The aspect of Suzuki cited by the Examiner

discloses that in a computer network environment, personal computers, workstations and I/O devices are interconnected and that networked I/O devices are accessible via the network to a network computer user so that a user can selected from a number of devices to perform an I/O operation.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion of creating transfer-data to be transferred to a client (attachment unit 19 as cited by the Examiner) in the respective column and lines of Suzuki cited by the Examiner.

Claim 1 further recites "a transfer-data processing by the network-connected equipment, the transfer-data processing including acquiring the transfer-data created at the creating of the transfer data,  extracting the processing data from the transfer-data, and performing a processing on the extracted processing data." The Examiner asserts that col. 2, lines 8-10 of Suzuki teaches this aspect of the claim.

The respective column and lines cited by the Examiner discloses that print data is formatted and sent via an Internet/Intranet to a designated printer.  However, there is no teaching or suggestion of the transfer-data processing including <u>acquiring</u> the transfer-data created at the creating of the transfer data, <u>extracting the processing data from the transfer-data</u>, and <u>performing a processing on the extracted processing data.</u>  Specifically, Suzuki merely discloses the conversion of reproduction data according to the reproduction device 18.  There is no teaching or suggestion of extracting processing data from transfer-data (reproduction data as asserted by the Examiner) or that a processing is performed on the extracted processing data.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable.

### III.     Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Azumi (JP 2002-183114; hereinafter "Azumi").

### Claim 2

Claim 2 recites "wherein the creating includes putting, when the **server** transfers markup language format data to the network-connected equipment as a response to the access, a **predetermined special-character string for identification indicating a data area where processing-data to be processed by the network-connected equipment is described in a comment portion in a comment tag of the markup language format data.**"

The Examiner asserts that col. 22, lines 41-44 of Suzuki discloses a predetermined special-character string for identification indicating a data area where processing-data is to be processed by the network-connected equipment.  The aspect of Suzuki cited by the Examiner discloses that attachment unit 19 analyzes a selected file's attribute information to determine whether the file is of a format that may be printed by a copier (e.g., image data such as HTML bitmap image data).

However, Suzuki merely discloses the printing of a file data.  Further, the file data can be image data that is HTML bitmap image data.  However, there is no teaching or suggestion that a server (server 15 as cited by the Examiner) transfers markup language format data to the network-connected equipment (reproduction device 18 as cited by the Examiner).  Further, although Suzuki discloses that image data can be HTML bitmap image data, there is no teaching or suggestion that a predetermined special-character string, for identification <u>indicating a data area where processing-data to be processed by the network-connected equipment</u>, is described.

The Examiner concedes that Suzuki does not teach processing-data to be processed by the network-connected equipment is described **in a comment portion in a comment tag of the markup language format data**, and cites Azumi, para. [0030] to cure the deficiency.

The aspect of Azumi cited by the Examiner discloses the use of a comment sentence field of an HTML format in the creation of a homepage. The comment sentence does not influence a program when a programmer manufactures programs. See para. [0023]. The comment sentence is not displayed on a screen. An exclusive browser identifies the comment sentence which starts in G@.

However, the comment portion of Azumi is directed to the appropriate display of a webpage so as to be consistent with a browser. Azumi is not at all concerned with the transfer of data to a network-connected equipment which does not have a user interface. Therefore, Azumi does not teach or suggest wherein the creating includes putting, when the server transfers markup language format data to the network-connected equipment as a response to the access, a **predetermined special-character string for identification indicating a data area where processing-data to be processed by the network-connected equipment is described in a comment portion in a comment tag of the markup language format data**, as claimed. Further, Azumi does not cure the deficiencies of Suzuki.

For at least the above reasons, claim 2 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable.

### IV.  Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.  If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.  Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC                              Ruthleen E. Uy
Telephone:  (202) 293-7060                      Registration No. 51,361
Facsimile:  (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date:  September 10, 2007